

## REMARKS

1. The examiner objects to the specification for possible errors in paragraphs 0006 and 0012. These are corrected by the present amendments to the specification. As requested, applicant reviewed the specification and various other minor corrections are submitted. No new material has been added.

2. The examiner objects to claims 9 and 10 for typographical errors. These are corrected in the present amendments to the claims. The amendments do not affect the substantive scope of these claims.

3. The examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, alleging the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for the claim. The applicant disagrees. The specification recites light source and provides DDFL and LED as examples of a light source. The specification does not limit the light source to a specific configuration. However, in an attempt to expedite prosecution, claim 10 is amended to refer to a CCFL light source only. A new claim 11, dependent from claim 1, refers to an LED array.

4. The examiner rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kerschner (U.S. Patent 6,098,947). See discussion below.


5. The examiner rejects claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kerschner (U.S. Patent 6,098,947) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of well known art. See discussion below.

The applicant traverses the forgoing rejections and requests reconsideration.

The application includes claims 1-10 prior to entering this amendment. The applicant amends claims 1, 3, 4, 9 and 10 in this reply. Claim 2 is canceled. New claims 11-22 are submitted for examination. The application remains with claims 1 and 3-22 after this amendment.


## Discussion

The Section 103(a) grounds for rejection of claims 1-7 are not well taken and should be reconsidered for the following reasons. First, Kerschner is directed specifically to a hand-held scanner assembly. The problem addressed there is dropping the scanner. "One problem associated with hand-held scanners is that they may be subjected to rough handling and occasionally may even be dropped onto the floor. Such rough handling and occasional dropping may place extreme shock loads on the various components of the hand-held scanner, and efforts are continually being made to ensure that the various components of the hand-held scanners can withstand such shock loads."<sup>1</sup> Kerschner teaches mounting clips directly contacting the mirror, as best seen in Kerschner FIGS. 1 and 8, shown below. In FIG. 1, see clips 26, 28, 30 directly contacting the mirror 14.




Similarly, Kerschner shows direct contact of the clips on the mirror 14 in FIG. 8:

<sup>1</sup> Kerschner (U.S. Patent 6,098,947) at column 1, lines 56-63.  
AMENDMENT




**FIG. 8**

Kerschner does not teach or suggest a buffer pad disposed in between the each mounting clip and the corresponding mirror so that the mounting clip does not directly contact the mirror reflecting surface, as recited in claim 1. To the contrary, Kerschner teaches placing a pad in between the mirror and the base or frame 12, as best seen in FIG. 9 below.



**FIG. 9**

In FIG. 9, note the clip 48 still directly contacts the mirror surface 14. The pad 38 is below the mirror 14 so it does not cushion the mounting clip. FIG. 6 below gives a clear view of the Kerschner structure with the mirror removed.



**FIG. 6**

Amended claim 1 recites:

“wherein each of the fixing elements comprises a reflecting mirror supporting holder and at least one clip for clipping one of the reflecting mirrors to the corresponding mirror supporting holder; [and]

a buffer pad disposed in between the each mounting clip and the corresponding mirror so that the mounting clip does not directly contact the mirror reflecting surface.”

As discussed above, Kerschner does not teach or suggest, among other things, these features. For at least these reasons, claims 1-11 are patentable over the art of record.

New claims 12-22 include features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. For at least this reason, and for the additional features of these claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is requested. The examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 73552**

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/Micah D. Stolorowicz/

---

Micah D. Stolorowicz  
Reg. No. 32,758

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP  
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 224-2170